



Elton Mayo and the Early Political Psychology of Harold D. Lasswell

Author(s): Richard C. S. Trahair

Source: *Political Psychology*, Vol. 3, No. 3/4 (Autumn, 1981 - Winter, 1982), pp. 170-188

Published by: [International Society of Political Psychology](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3791146>

Accessed: 14/07/2013 19:15

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



International Society of Political Psychology is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Political Psychology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

History Note

Elton Mayo and the Early Political Psychology of Harold D. Lasswell¹

RICHARD C. S. TRAHAIR

*Department of Sociology
La Trobe University
Melbourne, Australia*

This paper describes a little-known episode in the life of Harold D. Lasswell (1902-1978) and suggests what may be an important influence on his contribution to political psychology in America.

The history of ideas becomes enriched and the study of a particular scholar is enhanced when we recognize that feelings, sentiments, and interpersonal experiences as well as ideas and concepts contribute to the relation between the works of scholars. Lasswell (1930, p. 1) once wrote that study of political science without biography is a form of taxidermy. The same goes for the history of political thought, and for Lasswell's place in it.

Lasswell pioneered American research in political psychology with his Psychopathology and Politics published in 1930. It studies three types of political men--agitators, administrators, and theorists--and offers a psychoanalytic interpretation of their personal development. Lasswell's ideas are remarkably like those of George Elton Mayo (1880-1949), an Australian scholar with whom Lasswell worked from late in 1926 to May 1927. Before coming to the United States Mayo had published a book and several articles which applied the ideas of psychoanalysts to political behavior. At the time he met Mayo, Lasswell had published a text which mentions the behavior of

community agitators, an article on national pride and political motives, and, in his doctoral dissertation, discussed the redirection of community hostility onto government in wartime propaganda. Nowhere had he, himself, however, applied the insights of modern psychology, psychopathology, or psychoanalysis to political behavior before meeting Mayo.

This paper presents evidence for the argument that at a crucial stage in his personal life, Harold Lasswell had help from Elton Mayo, and, as a result, discovered that the psychoanalytic ideas which Mayo used to illuminate personal problems could be applied to the behavior of politicians.

The following evidence shows: (1) Mayo's political psychology is similar to, and predates Lasswell's work; (2) Mayo's early political psychology was well-known and respected by Lasswell's mentor, Charles E. Merriam, who suggested the young man work under Mayo and receive personal counselling; (3) before he met Mayo, Lasswell's political psychology lacked the ideas from psychopathology found in Mayo's earlier work and after working with Mayo, Lasswell's political writing included Mayo's description and explanation of the agitator's behavior; (4) Lasswell recognized Mayo's perception of the relations between psychopathology and social life, remembered the importance of the psychopathological interview in elucidating such perception, and recalled Mayo's role in their close association; and (5) Mayo introduced Lasswell to the psychopathological interview technique and the way to measure psychological correlates of mental conflict.

The paper concludes with a reconstruction of the likely events which led to Lasswell's early contribution to political psychology, the role of Elton Mayo in Lasswell's life, and suggests where further evidence may be sought to extend or modify the reconstruction.

MAYO'S PSYCHOLOGY OF THE AGITATOR OR DESTROYER

Elton Mayo was born and raised in Adelaide, South Australia. After failing his medical studies, he went to Europe and Africa. He returned home and studied philosophy under Sir William Mitchell, joined the faculty of the University of Queensland and, after the Great War, turned his attention to the psychology of social, industrial, and political

problems. In July 1922 he went to the United States. Four years later he joined the faculty of the Harvard Business School. As Professor of Industrial Research, Mayo became associated with the Hawthorne studies of the Western Electric Company in Chicago, the study of human and social aspects of work in many industries, and the practical use of research in what is now known as organizational behavior.

Mayo (1922) published five articles on industrial peace and psychological research, one of which, The Mind of the Agitator, described a patient of a Brisbane (Queensland) doctor, Thomas H. R. Matthewson. The patient, a man of 30, was unable to hold a job because he could not take orders from foremen. A self-styled rebel he publicly denounced all forms of authority and upheld social revolution as the cure for society's ills. Diagnosis showed he and his mother had suffered brutal beatings from the patient's alcoholic father. Mayo concluded that the father was the main cause of the patient's resentment to all people in authority.

The case helped Mayo clarify ideas about agitators whom he had seen among officials of the Australian Labor Party. Although the men were highly intelligent, when they sought to redress social evils, they became disoriented because they were unable to collaborate with other men. They were genuine neurotics whose mental disintegration reflected a history of cruelty in infancy. Within the social constraints of the day, these men could not enjoy any freedom for themselves. They were social melancholics who projected their inner troubles onto a reputedly conspiratorial and exploitative social order that had brought great suffering to mankind. Victims of an inner hate, these men were obsessed with the savage destruction of the evil social order. Family strife, poor education, and inhuman work conditions had not allowed these men to integrate their phantasies with their capacity for concentrated thought. In this disintegrated, neurotic mental state, they preferred phantasy to reality, because it provided both a refuge from and compensation for real values. To Mayo the phantasy constructions of these neurotic men were clear from the ideologies they espoused, e.g., socialism, guild-socialism, anarchism, satanism.

In June 1939 Mayo published Routine Interaction and the Problem of Collaboration, and in 1948 revised it as Psychopathology and Social Study shortly after he retired. Again we

met the thirty year old agitator. "I am opposed to kings, capitalists, labor politicians, and trade union secretaries," the agitator is reputed to have shouted at a public meeting. In treatment he developed a strong positive attachment to the doctor, presumably Matthewson, and a capacity for casual friendships which had been beyond him. After treatment he became a clerk and abandoned his political beliefs. He was one of several "destroyers" who had supported socialist, I.W.W., Bolshevik, or Communist causes after the Great War and whom Mayo had found at union mass meetings. Mayo would see more cases among his patients at the Boston Psychopathic Clinic ten years hence. Again they are described as intelligent individuals with a savage and unrelenting opposition to a hostile world that had denied opportunities to most people and evoked in them a sense of impending calamity. For these men the world was in a crisis and the immediate task was to change society through revolution, not reform.

The "agitator" of the 1922 Australian article is the "destroyer" of the 1939 and 1948 essay. The 1939 essay extends the Australian article with an American illustration and serves to introduce Mayo's interpretation of Hitler's personality; the 1948 essay used ideas in Janet's psychology which Mayo had been using before leaving Australia. The agitator had impaired interpersonal relations, i.e., he could not collaborate. The destroyer found easy casual relations with other men were not possible; he had no conversation, only oratory, self-history, or silence; he could tolerate no one, he could trust no one, and suspected conspiracies even among his fellows; he had no sense of humor. In short, he had no friends, only fellow protagonists.

In explaining the agitators' or destroyers' behavior, Mayo pointed to their early life in which a grave defect had made them socially ignorant and incapable, and prepared them for a life of rebellion rather than social participation. To achieve a sane, mature, and non-neurotic view of the world, Mayo assumed individuals required a good biological endowment, intelligent parents, and a well-ordered community life. In the agitators' or destroyers' early life, and at each stage in their development, the experience of friendship was lacking. Their partners may have been adequate, but outside the immediate family the destroyers had no equivalent relationship with their own generation. A lack of friends and inadequate relations with their age peers led, first, to feelings of resentment

rather than of belonging to any group, of being a convicted outcast, and to an extravagant need to dominate others; and second, to an unadmitted feeling of superiority over their age peers. Mayo's thesis was that among political agitators personal problems are displaced onto public objects, expressed in the form of an ideology like socialism, and rationalized to meet the public interest.

Mayo's political writing in 1922 and its extension in 1939 and 1948 did not have a direct influence on developments in the application of psychopathology to politics. But the ideas in the 1922 paper probably had an indirect influence on Lasswell's thesis that in the political man private motives are displaced onto a public object and rationalized in terms of public interest.

LASSWELL'S PSYCHOLOGY OF THE AGITATOR

Mayo's theory of agitators or destroyers is remarkably like Lasswell's theory of the agitator. In his first discussion of agitators, Lasswell (1927) described them as "romantic, impatient, intolerant, impersonal, and exhortatory." They were excited and communicated this feeling to others. They shocked, horrified, and scandalized. In their contentious and undisciplined mental life, agitators had an "obsessive preoccupation with particular measures" aiming at "instant, all-encompassing, drastic innovation" (In Mayo's terms they were destroyers; and "obsessive preoccupations" was a favored term of his.) Their thinking was dominated by principles, rather than human needs, and they were alert to "pernicious intrusions of private interest into public affairs." Relations with others were impersonal; "they see 'unworthy' motives where others see the just claims of friendship," and in their opponents the agitators saw bad faith and timidity. Among their fellows even dangers existed; "many reforming ships are manned by mutineers." The agitator trusted only the masses, and "the magic of rhetoric to conjure any obstacles with the ritualistic repetition of principles." [In his political writings between 1904 and 1922, Mayo had made this point frequently (see Trahair, 1981).] They thought with "a single, overmastering dichotomy," a "'this or that', a 'yes or no' situation." [To Mayo this was the false dichotomy (see Roethlisberger, 1960).] Finally, Lasswell recognized the origins of political behavior: heredity, psychological factors, childhood, adult experience,

culture. In his second and comprehensive study of agitators, Lasswell (1930) said they were unable to work quietly without swings of mood, sensed urgency in all that's to be done, and for this reason could not wait for recognition from either many followers or a special few; again they were destroyers who could not create or build aesthetic patterns or develop technical abstractions. Agitators had defective interpersonal relations; they preferred the mass to the individual's response and were quite unable to respond to the emotions of those near them.

Because Lasswell studied many agitators closely and compared their psychopathology with that of other political types, he, more than Mayo, elaborated on the psychodynamics of the agitator. Even so their descriptions and explanations overlap markedly. When Lasswell explained the agitator's behavior, he said that in their early life strong narcissistic experiences had been engendered by either excessively frustrated love or an over-indulgent family; also there had been repression of open and direct shows of hatred and, during puberty, impoverishment of full warm relationships with peers. (These points were made by Mayo in his discussions of family life in 1925 and 1927.³) Later Lasswell (1948) would emphasize damaged self-esteem as a general and more potent cause of power needs. The role of self-esteem was central to Mayo's writings in 1922, and it was re-emphasized in 1948.

MAYO'S EARLY POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGY

In 1922 Mayo landed in America and met Charles E. Merriam and Beardsley Rumel.⁴ Merriam, a leading political scientist, was planning the structure and activities of the Social Science Research Council. On many points Mayo's views were cognate with those of Merriam.⁵ Both had optimistic views of democracy, despite its apparent failings before and during the recent war, and they agreed that, although it was easy to recognize and plan for continuing conflicts among diverse interests, cooperation and friendliness could be engendered by the application of intelligent thought to problems of human conflict. To this end citizens should be well educated and politicians and administrators should be well trained; such training could be founded best on reliable, scientific knowledge of society; and such knowledge would come from applied social and political research among the universities.

Merriam wanted research that used improved techniques of data collection and analysis, called on practical political experience, and could use readily the insights available in sociology and Freudian psychology to clarify political problems in modern democracies. He had also rejected Socialism, because it gave the state too much control over the economy. Finally, both men were dissatisfied with the free enterprise system because its rapid, unthinking, and sometimes rapacious growth made for a source of great power outside a democratic nation's control. Merriam and his colleague, Vernon Kellogg, were so impressed by Mayo that they spoke of taking him to talk with Herbert Hoover, the U.S. Secretary of Commerce. After their first discussion, Merriam, Kellogg, and their associates sent Mayo to New York with a letter of introduction to Beardsley Ruml.

Ruml had recently been appointed as stop-gap director of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Foundation. He would become one of Mayo's most valued friends in America, and the man largely responsible for Mayo's being so well established in America's academic life. The son of a doctor in Cedar Rapids, Ruml was born in 1894. He was educated at Dartmouth College where he was distinguished by a curious combination of high intelligence, playful loafing, and brilliant ideas. At the University of Chicago he completed a Ph.D. in psychology and education, and furthered his unusual technique of inventive thinking: He would sit alone and muse, maintaining a waking dream-state and allowing reveries to emerge which he could follow wherever his attention dispersed itself. After graduation Ruml became an assistant to Walter V. Bingham, an industrial psychologist. As co-director of the Division of Trade Tests during the war, Ruml became skilled in the development of mental tests, and, for a short time after the war, he worked with his Army boss, Walter D. Scott, and became an adviser to managers in the Armour and Swift companies. Then John D. Rockefeller, Jr. asked Ruml to survey New York's leading cultural institutions and advise him on how their value to the public might be raised. The excellence of Ruml's work and his engaging personal style led him to immediate acceptance among New York's influentials. At twenty-seven he was made director of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Foundation while the advisers to the Rockefeller philanthropists sought a more experienced man for the post. However, with high energy, calculated boldness, and intelligent, practical ideas, Ruml pursued a scheme to disburse 75 to 80 million dollars on

scientific, long-term, and large-scale research in sociology, political science, economics, psychology, and anthropology. The Rockefeller advisers had always preferred small, traditional projects on current issues, but Rum1 overcame their resistance. Eventually he earned the reputation as a founder of the social sciences in America. In 1930 he would leave the Rockefeller philanthropists for the University of Chicago, become the Treasurer of R.H. Macy's and, in 1942, produce his most noted idea, the pay-as-you-go income tax plan (see the New Yorker, 1942, 1945; Karl, 1974).

Although Rum1 was fourteen years younger than Mayo, of great bulk, and born in America, at this point their differences faded. Both men had come from a medical family and had learned to value clinical observation; both had studied issues in education, the new medical psychology, learned how to use one's mental hinterland for imaginative thinking, the importance of a scientific base for reliable knowledge, and the value of applied knowledge. The overlap in their professional interests was augmented by a mutual pleasure in witty and intelligent conversation on diverse topics, a thorough knowledge and love of excellent wine and gourmet foods. In March 1923, Rum1's personal efforts got Mayo enough money to begin research in the Department of Industrial Research at the Wharton School of Commerce and Finance, University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia and to continue there until he began work at Harvard in September 1926 (see Trahair, 1981).

Early in 1924, after a year at the Wharton School, Mayo wrote A New Way of Statecraft, and sent a copy to Rum1.⁶ Rum1 replied asking if he might show these interesting ideas "to two or three people around who would be interested." For a critical comparison of Rousseau and Machiavelli, Mayo had taken ideas from Webb's Decay of Capitalist Civilization, Masterman's England after the War, Wallas' The Great Society, and Hobhouse's Metaphysical Theory of the State. The central thesis was that one, and only one, of Machiavelli's propositions is valuable for an understanding of the business of statecraft, i.e., that the State will cohere best if someone makes it his business to understand the human aspects of social issues, rather than, as Rousseau suggested, accept that in general assembly human passions would, somehow, cancel themselves out. From Machiavelli, Mayo argued, we learned that no one could lead men who did not understand them. Moreover, Mayo contended the world's rulers at that time were performing badly. There

was an urgent need for a better understanding of human passions so rulers might use them in the service of the State rather than, as Machiavelli elsewhere suggested, to balance powerful factions such that they would support only the ruler. To achieve such understanding, Mayo recommended an informal meeting of appropriately qualified men. Sentimentalists, socialists, and reactionaries should not be invited; conversation only, no formal papers. A small-scale investigation of intrasocial and international issues should develop from the meeting, he argued. From this interchange would come scientific knowledge on the human condition which could be used to train international and industrial leaders.

In July 1925, Mayo replied to a letter from Merriam which asked the following question: What have anthropology, psychopathology, and clinical psychology to contribute to social and political research? Mayo said that anthropology shows primitive thinking is like the ritualistic thought processes of a civilized obsessional; in civilized men emotion and fatigue heighten the common tendency to primitive and obsessional ideas and the failure to distinguish clearly between reality and fantasy.

Psychopathology distinguishes obsessional neurosis (melancholia and paranoia) and hysteria (psychasthenia and possibly dementia). The obsessionals tended to be Freud's cases, often city dwellers and educated. The hysterics were mainly Janet's cases; many were country dwellers and usually uneducated. Obsessionals tend to insomnia, are more annoyed than startled by loud sounds, pre-occupied with sustained obsessive ideas, suffer from a moral anxiety or conviction of sin, and their crimes, if any, are crimes of passion. Hysterics are most easily hypnotized, readily startled by unexpected noises, victims of confused and interrupted thinking, and suffer from sudden spasms of panic.

To these distinctions research in clinical psychology adds another twelve among which two are relevant to work. Obsessionals with their parasympathetic nervous system tend to have a low blood pressure and pulse rate between 48 and 76; hysterics, dominated by a sympathetic nervous system, have a higher blood pressure and pulse rate between 78 and 100. The thinking of groups and individuals is determined by their tendency to be hysteric-sympathetic or obsessional-parasympathetic types. The tendencies toward such thinking, and consequent action, may be

assessed indirectly through blood pressure measurements. To illustrate the thesis Mayo described results of medical examinations for fatigue on two normal employees in a spinning mill at Germantown, Philadelphia.

Mayo thought these results were relevant to political behavior, especially political unrest led by agitation. Evidence shows that revolutions occur only in those countries where the sympathetic type (high blood pressure) predominates. Revolutionary industrial strife is led by parasympathetic types who indulge in sustained obsessional thinking. They are industrial and political agitators, and are followed by sympathetics who panic and show violent explosions of emotion. In the obsessional-parasympathetic types--the agitators--fatigue and ignorance induces obsessional thinking and lack of coordination. Thus, the first step in controlling industrial and political unrest is to reduce fatigue at work so that obsessional preoccupations can return to normal and rational thinking.

Mayo believed that, in 1925, an economic authority from Soviet Russia was visiting the United States to discover how revolutions could be ended. The Soviet authorities had apparently found that revolutionaries are paranoid. Mayo proposed to Merriam that high Soviet authorities make factories and village communes available to his investigations and experiments. He would show how to abolish fatigue, make important physiological changes among individuals, and deal with hysteria in a psychopathological fashion. Mayo supposed he would find most peasants and workers were hysteric-sympathetic types, and their leaders obsessional-parasympathetic. Backed by the arbitrary authority of the Soviet leadership, Mayo wanted to change the work situation after his investigation. He assumed the Russian situation would be primitive, and, from his research, that methods could be devised to approach the complex problems of industrial civilization.

As early as 1922 Merriam had sensed the value of psychopathology for political science; and in 1925 Mayo was known to Merriam as a psychopathologist who could state clearly the relation between physiological fatigue, mental health, and social and political behavior. One of Merriam's outstanding young students was Harold Lasswell (see Karl, 1974). During 1926-27 Merriam arranged for Lasswell, who had been personally unsettled for a time, to work with Mayo in his first year at

the Harvard Business School (see Lasswell, 1930, p. xxiii).⁸ Lasswell was with Mayo from late in 1926 to May 1927, and the following evidence suggests Mayo left an impact on the young man's development as an individual and as a psychopathologist as well as on his formulation of research problems.

LASSWELL'S EARLY POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGY

Lasswell wrote three times on political psychology and agitators before Mayo met him. First, Atkins and Lasswell (1924) outlined agitators' behavior in community life, gave modern examples, and concluded that agitators differed based on the stage their cause had reached. However, the authors did not consider the agitators' personal history, biological environment, motives, or style of thought. Second, Lasswell (1925) drew attention to forgotten studies of national pride and political motives published over a hundred years before, and cited modern writers, e.g., Dicey and Wallas, both of whom were familiar to Mayo. Again, Lasswell made no reference to the application of psychology to the behavior of agitators. Third, in a discussion of the theory of political propaganda drawn from his doctoral dissertation, Lasswell (1927a) asserted that social revolutionaries may, during war time, use propaganda to redirect community hostility from the enemy to the government and, thus, destroy the community. In the three writings Lasswell does not discuss the personal history or the psychology of the agitator. Only after he worked with Mayo did Lasswell apply insights from psychopathology to political activists.

LASSWELL ON MAYO

In his preface to Psychopathology and Politics, Lasswell (1930) wrote of Mayo's "perception of the bearing of psychopathology upon the understanding of social [and business] life."

Twenty-five years later, Lasswell (1955) remembered more about his book's origin. At the time he wrote Psychopathology and Politics, he had been a professional student of political behavior not a professional practitioner of psychoanalysis. He quoted the only publications he could find on psychoanalysis and politics to show that there was no tradition of publishing

in this field in the late 1920s. He was exposed to a training analysis from psychoanalysts and physicians or psychologists heavily indebted to Freud. It was then that he drew the case material together with critical reviews of Kraepelin, Watson, Pavlov, McDougall, Wertheim, Stern, and Angell. But it was not the application of psychoanalytic ideas that occupied him at the time; he was more impressed by the observational procedures innovated by Freud than by Freud's theory. The most distinctive innovation was the prolonged interview and the use of free association and interpretation for scientific and therapeutic purposes. To him the method seemed to contain within it the seeds of its own correction.

Forty-five years later Lasswell recalled the time he spent with Mayo. He said he had become so close to Mayo that he felt at ease addressing him as "Elton" not as "Professor" or "Mr. Mayo." Lasswell recalled that Mayo had the skills of a diplomat. He moved easily up and down the social hierarchy, and could handle people of different temperaments and different social standing. Mayo was witty, had great charm, and could persuade people to accept his suggestions. Sometimes his influence could arouse hostility among those who enjoyed and often wished for more of his favors. He was an academic entrepreneur to some, and a helper to others. "He could get permission for you to do things that you wanted to do." And his activities rested on the knife edge of social science between ethics and manipulation. Mayo was not a deep thinker. With a few categories of ideas taken mainly from Sir William Mitchell, he would take old problems and recreate them, make innovative suggestions, and lead his listener to new insights. He knew enough physiology to see that the buzz word of the day "industrial fatigue" had limited application as long as physiological studies focused exclusively on the body's muscles. He knew a psychology of fatigue was needed.

Under Mayo's supervision, Lasswell counselled students who were suffering the transient problems of early adulthood (sexual, financial, religious, marital, identity, and career) and learned interviewing. Further interview training came when Mayo arranged for Lasswell to see neurotic and psychotic patients in the care of McFie Campbell, Director of the Boston Psychopathic Hospital. This prim little Scot psychiatrist admired Mayo's approach and allowed him the privileges of a qualified psychiatrist.

With Mayo's help, Lasswell at one point enjoyed a quite positive reputation in McFie Campbell's eyes. It seems a young, blond, 200 pound student in the Harvard Business School threatened to shoot the Dean of the school. Rather than put the lad in jail, he was placed in Mayo's charge. Mayo put the student into Lasswell's hands. Lasswell felt highly anxious about seeing the patient. Mayo instructed Lasswell to behave as if there were nothing the matter with the young man, unless his behavior proved otherwise. "I am glad to see you," the young man said to Lasswell, "because there has been a terrible mistake." He explained that personal problems, considerable frustration, and fatigue from overwork had led to the threat he had made on the Dean's life and that, with sensible planning of his studies, he now could manage. Lasswell listened attentively to what the patient said. Next day, as was the practice at the Hospital, the patient was paraded before an audience of two hundred or so doctors. The case was presented, diagnosis was outlined, and questions were put to the patient. In reply he turned to McFie Campbell and said, "I am quite well now. And I would like to thank your assistant for his greaat help--Dr. Lasswell." The audience were tremendously impressed by Lasswell's remarkable success with the dangerous young fellow. McFie Campbell was aghast, but had to accept the situation until he could have a word with Mayo later. Mayo stood firmly by Lasswell's teatment and proper cure of the patient. Later Mayo told Lasswell that he had known what would happen all along.

MAYO ON LASSWELL

"Lasswell is doing well here," Mayo wrote to Beardsley Ruml in January 1927.¹⁰ Of Lasswell's work at the Psychopathic Hospital, Mayo wrote, "Lasswell has his coat off to it and is swimming strongly in the dark waters." A month later Mayo wrote, "We have handled quite a number of psychoneurotic students (mostly business school but some others) thanks to Lasswell who has 'come on' most excellently as a psychopathologist. Lasswell has 'tasted blood,' he has had the joy of seeing students come back to cheerfulness and renewed capacity for work in his hands. I had him with me in a case referred by [Dr] Packer [medical officer at the Harvard Business School]--a graduate (number one in intelligence and achievement) who recovered from four weeks of 'indigestion' in one hour--ate a large lunch with us without discomfort."

Mayo continued the letter with an account of the informal discussion between Mayo, Packard, a young psychologist, Henry A. Murray, Lawrence J. Henderson, and Dean Donham which led to the establishment in the Harvard Business School of a laboratory to study psychological, medical, physiological, and social factors associated with fatigue. Mayo wrote, "I think it would interest you to summon Lasswell to N.Y. [the New York offices of the Rockefeller Foundation] and talk things over with him. He will give you the spectator's point of view, for he has been pretty well 'in' most of this with us--and doing well." By the middle of May 1927 the Fatigue Laboratory was established with a budget of \$150,000. Lasswell was in Chicago in May; he wrote asking Mayo "with appropriate apologies, to look over a 'psycho' student of [the University of] Chicago, son of a professor. I have wired him to send the youngster in--and if the latter is an appropriate case I will enlist Roethlisberger's assistance."¹²

CLINICAL AND PHYSIOLOGICAL WORK

Lasswell came to Mayo for counselling late in 1926. Many of Mayo's assistants came to him for counselling, and they acknowledged his help, e.g., Ursula McConnel in Queensland, Frits Roethlisberger, T. North Whitehead, Eyres-Monsell in America.¹³ Mayo's therapeutic technique was first to show the young assistant how to interview, then discuss a case with him, and finally hand him cases of his own. Invariably the psychopathology of the patient led the interviewer to reflect on his own mental functioning, discuss this experience with Mayo, and accept Mayo's advice on what to read to help him interpret both the patients' and his own mental life. In this close clinical relationship all features of an older person's influence is subtle, deep, and often cut out of awareness.

During 1927-28 Mayo had 47 clinical cases referred to him, of which 26 were from within the Business School, 13 from the University as a whole, and 8 from outside the University. Also he began research for the Boston Manufacturing Company at Waltham, Massachusetts where clinical interviews and blood pressure readings were taken early in 1927 by Osborne and Roethlisberger. In September 1927, Mayo received a psychogalvanometer, and took readings from many individuals which were then correlated with their word associations. Observations were made while these individuals talked and while they

relaxed. For two years Mayo had been studying physiological correlates of observations made on individuals alone and in interaction with others. He used not only subjects from industry, but individuals who sought his advice. Among the people whose blood pressure was taken between May and November 1927 were Harvard Business School faculty members and office staff, the stroke of the Harvard crew, Mayo's wife whose health was poor at that time, Roethlisberger who was a melancholic student who would later become close to Mayo, Osgood Loveking who was Mayo's young assistant, and Lasswell.¹⁴

Mayo's ideas bear a further relation to Lasswell's later career as a psychologist. In 1928-29 Lasswell visited Europe and underwent a short psychoanalysis with Theodore Reik. At that time Lasswell spoke with many psychiatrists and psychoanalysts, and found none who "could see any merit in trying to obtain verbatim interviews, or of extending the record to include physiological changes.... I returned in 1929 fully confident of the importance of objectifying the interview situation." Lasswell then scandalized Chicago's orthodox psychiatrists by analyzing volunteers and correlating their interview data with changes in pulse rate and skin resistance (see Marvick, 1977, p. 27).

CONCLUSION

In what ways are the work of Mayo and Lasswell similar? First, both men used ideas from psychopathology to elucidate political experience and behavior; second, for a short period, both men thought physiological differences between individuals might help explain variations in individual, social, and political behavior. This similarity suggests that Mayo had some influence on Lasswell's work.

The evidence shows that Lasswell worked under Mayo, and their relationship, although short, was remarkably close. Under Mayo, Lasswell learned how to conduct the psychoanalytic, biographical, or prolonged interview, and came to envy and admire Mayo's influence and abilities. Mayo helped Lasswell, encouraged and acknowledged Lasswell's personal development in psychopathological work, and not only allowed him to become familiar with the plans to establish the Fatigue Laboratory at the Harvard Business School, but suggested his views be considered by those with power to decide on the matter.

Subsequently Lasswell took up this kind of research in Chicago. Also, Lasswell probably was one of Mayo's own cases, and because of this, among other factors, Lasswell became an analyst in Berlin for a short time.

Apart, however, from the evidence already cited, Mayo gave no indication that he had directly influenced young Lasswell's thinking and in his writings Lasswell does not state he was influenced by Mayo. So at an intellectual level the influence of Mayo on Lasswell can be based, at present, on only the similarity of their ideas and the sequence of events before, during, and after their close but short association. Probably Lasswell learned much from Mayo's conversations on the mental life of political agitators. But Lasswell could not formally acknowledge Mayo's writings because, in America at least, Mayo never referred students to them.¹⁵

From evidence collected so far the episode we are describing in Lasswell's life may be reconstructed as follows. During his early twenties Lasswell established the basis of a promising academic career, but in 1925 suffered a deep personal crisis. Recognizing that the crisis could deleteriously affect the career of one of his outstanding students, Merriam sent Lasswell for help in 1926-27 to Elton Mayo. Merriam respected Mayo for both his ideas on political psychology and his sensitive clinical skills as a psychopathologist. Mayo treated Lasswell as he did other young intelligent men whose obsessional preoccupations had interfered with their capacity for concentration and productive thought. Mayo showed the young man how to study obsessions in others, and taught him that much of the irrationality in the thinking and behavior of political ideologies arises partly from their uncontrolled obsessions and reveries, which, in turn, take their origin from early childhood traumas. Following Mayo's ideas, Lasswell learned that among political agitators personal problems are displaced onto public objects, expressed as ideologies, and rationalized in the public interest. Also, he learned that physiological measures could be taken which were assumed to be objective correlates of mental conflicts. In May 1927 Lasswell returned to Chicago to continue clinical work using the skills he had acquired under Mayo's tutelage. At the same time Lasswell began collecting data for his research on psychopathology and political behavior. When, where, and from whom the data were collected is not securely known, because, ten years later, they were accidentally destroyed. Probably the data were collected in

1927-28 in several places--Chicago, Boston, New York--and analyzed for publication in a book. In 1928-29 Lasswell went to Europe, travelled, visited numerous scholars, underwent a short psychoanalysis, and returned to America before the book was published. Then he took up research on the physiological correlates of behavior during the clinical interview. At this point all traces of the connection between Mayo and Lasswell disappear.

This reconstruction suggests a connection between the political psychology of Mayo and Lasswell and presents in bold relief a chapter in the development of the cross-disciplinary ideas that have become part of political psychology. In working on the definition of political psychology, we can benefit from delving into the histories of those who were early interested in the intersection between psychology and political behavior.

NOTES

1. The author is grateful for financial support from the Ford Foundation and La Trobe University. Research assistance came from Julie Marshall (La Trobe University), George F. F. Lombard and Robert Lovett (Harvard University), and archivists at the Rockefeller Foundation Archives. Helpful comments were made by Alfred W. Clark and other colleagues in the Department of Sociology, La Trobe University. Parts of this paper are taken from the author's biography of George Elton Mayo (1880-1940).
2. A discussion of Mayo's false dichotomy and its relation to the obsessive preoccupations among agitators (and others) appears in the autobiography by Roethlisberger (1977).
3. On October 28, 1925 Mayo spoke on "Freedom for the Child; What Does It Mean?" to the Child Study Association Conference; early in January 1927, Mayo addressed a symposium concerned with parents on "The Father in the Present Day Home"; on January 27, 1927 Mayo lectured on "The Dynamics of Family Relationships" to the New York meeting of the Institute on Parental Education. Lasswell was working with Mayo in January 1927. See Mayo manuscripts, Baker Library, Harvard Business School.

4. Letters from Mayo to his wife, Dorothea Mayo, August 1922-March 1923; in the possession of Patricia Elton Mayo.
5. Compare Mayo (1919) with the material on Merriam in Karl (1974).
6. Ruml to Mayo, March 15, 1924; Archives of the Rockefeller Foundation (A.R.F.), New York.
7. Mayo to Merriam, July 25, 1925, A.R.F.
8. In January 1974 the late Fritz Roethlisberger told the author that he always had the impression Lasswell had been sent to Mayo for personal counselling. Lasswell, who was and would become a prolific writer, published nothing during the period before he was with Mayo. See the Lasswell bibliography in Marvick (1977).
9. Interview with Lasswell, May 6, 1975.
10. Mayo to Ruml, January 11, 1927, A.R.F.
11. Mayo to Ruml, February 9, 1927, A.R.F.
12. Mayo to Ruml, May 16, 1927, A.R.F.
13. Mayo correspondence, 1918-1947; in the possession of Patricia Elton Mayo.
14. Mayo manuscripts, Baker Library, Harvard Business School.
15. Conversations with Lombard, September 1975.

REFERENCES

- Atkins, W.E., and Lasswell, H.D. Labor attitudes and problems. London: Pitman, 1924.
- Karl, B.D. Charles E. Merriam and the study of politics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.
- Lasswell, H.D. Two forgotten studies in political psychology, American Political Science Review, 1925, 19, 707-717.
- Lasswell, H.D. The theory of political propaganda, American Political Science Review, 1927, 21, 627-631. (a)

- Lasswell, H.D. Types of political personalities, Proceedings of the American Sociological Society, 1927, 22, 159-168.
- (b)
- Lasswell, H.D. Psychopathology and politics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930.
- Lasswell, H.D. Power and personality. New York: Viking, 1948.
- Lasswell, H.D. Psychopathology and politics: Twenty-five years later. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, August, 1955, San Francisco. Reprinted and revised as "After thoughts: Thirty years later" in Viking Press 1960 edition of Psychopathology and politics.
- Marvick, D. (Ed.) Harold D. Lasswell on political sociology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.
- Mayo, E. Democracy and freedom: An essay in social logic. Melbourne: Macmillan, 1919.
- Mayo, E. Industrial peace and psychological research, Industrial Australian Mining Standard, 1922, 67, 16, 63, 111, 159-160, 253.
- Mayo, E. Routine interaction and the problem of collaboration, American Sociological Review, 1939, 4, 335-340.
- Mayo, E. Some notes on the psychology of Pierre Janet. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948.
- New Yorker, September 12, 1942, 12.
- New Yorker, February 10, 1945, 28-32, 35; February 17, 1945, 26-30, 33-34; February 24, 1945, 30-34, 36, 38-39.
- Roethlisberger, F.J. Introduction to Elton Mayo. In The human problems of an industrial civilization. New York: Viking, 1960.
- Roethlisberger, F.J. The elusive phenomena. Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1977.
- Trahair, R.C.S. Early contributions to the political psychology of Elton Mayo. In J. Walter (Ed.), Reading life histories. Nathan Queensland, Griffith University, Institute for Modern Biography, 1981. Distributed by Australian National University Press.